arXiv:1010.5681v1 [math.DG] 27 Oct 2010

PROJECTIVE INVARIANTS OF CR–HYPERSURFACES

C. HAMMOND AND C. ROBLES*

Abstract. We study the equivalence problem under projective transformation for CR-hypersurfaces of complex projective space. A complete set of projective differential invariants for analytic hypersurfaces is given. The self-dual strongly $\mathbb{C}$-linearly convex hypersurfaces are characterized.

1. Introduction

1.1. **History.** Before stating the equivalence problem addressed in this paper, we describe two related problems previously addressed in the literature.

Cartan studied the equivalence of real-analytic CR-hypersurfaces in complex 2-manifolds up to local biholomorphism [4, 3]. Chern and Moser generalized Cartan's result [6, 7], solving the equivalence problem for nondegenerate, real-analytic CR-hypersurfaces in complex n-manifolds modulo local biholomorphism [6, Theorem 4.6].

Following Chern and Moser, Jensen considered the equivalence problem for nondegenerate CR-hypersurfaces of complex projective space $\mathbb{P}W$ up to (local) projective deformation [11, 12, 13]. He showed that two nondegenerate CR-hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}W$ are locally first-order projective deformations of each other if and only if they locally biholomorphically equivalent [13, Theorem 7.2], and that two smooth CR–hypersurfaces are locally projectively equivalent if and only if they are locally second-order projective deformations of each other [12].

1.2. **Statement of the problem.** In this paper we apply techniques of E. Cartan [5, 9] to characterize CR-hypersurfaces in complex projective space up to projective transformation. While a projective transformation is a local biholomorphism of complex projective space $\mathbb{P}W$, it is not the case that every local biholomorphism of $\mathbb{P}W$ is a projective transformation: in particular we consider the equivalence problem under a smaller transformation group than Cartan and Chern–Moser. Likewise, Jensen's projective deformation is a more also a more general equivalence than projective congruence. (See Remark 3.8.)

Let W be a complex vector space, let $\mathbb{P}W$ denote the associated complex projective space. Given $w \in W$, let $[w]$ denote the corresponding point in $\mathbb{P}W$. Let $\mathrm{GL}(W)$ denote the space of complex linear automorphisms of W.

Date: October 28, 2010.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32V99.

Key words and phrases. Equivalence problem, CR-hypersurface.

*Robles is partially supported by NSF-DMS 0805782 & 1006353.

Definition 1.1. Every $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ naturally induces a *projective linear transformation* $A : \mathbb{P}W \to \mathbb{P}W$ by $[w] \mapsto [Aw]$. Two submanifolds S, $\widetilde{S} \in \mathbb{P}W$ are *projectively equivalent* if there exists a projective linear transformation A such that $A(S) = \widetilde{S}$.

1.3. **Contents.** The equivalence problem is lifted from CR-hypersurfaces $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ to frame bundles $\mathcal{F}_S \subset \mathrm{GL}(W)$ over S in Section 2.1. Projective differential invariants (of all orders) are defined in Section 3.1, and in Section 3.2 it is shown that set of invariants is complete (in the analytic category): they characterize the analytic CR-hypersurfaces up to projective equivalence (Proposition 3.11). Modulo normalizations (in Section 5), the set of second-order projective invariants is precisely the CR–second fundamental form. This is illustrated in Section 4 which presents the invariants from a slightly different, but sometimes computationally more convenient, perspective.

The self-dual strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex hypersurfaces are characterized in Section 6, see Theorem 6.8.

1.4. **Notation.** Fix the index ranges

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc} 0 & \leq & j,k & \leq & n+1\,, & \quad & 0 & \leq & a,b & \leq & m\,, & \quad & 1 & \leq & s,t \leq n \\ & & & & & & 0 & < & \alpha,\beta & < & m\,, & & 1 & < & \sigma,\tau < n\,. \end{array}$$

Let V be a real vector space of dimension $n+2 = 2m+2$ with a complex structure $\mathsf{J} : V \to V$, $\mathsf{J}^2 = -\mathrm{Id}$. Give (V, J) the structure of a complex vector space W by defining $\mathrm{i}v := \mathsf{J}v$, where $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Define an equivalence relation on $V \backslash \{0\}$ by $v \sim (xv + y\mathsf{J}v)$ for any $(0,0) \neq (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then the quotient space is naturally identified with $\mathbb{P}W \simeq \mathbb{CP}^m$.

Fix a basis $e = (e_0, \ldots, e_{n+1})$ of V with the property that

$$\mathsf{J}\, e_{2a} \;=\; e_{2a+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{J}\, e_{2a+1} \;=\; -e_{2a} \quad \forall\; 0 \leq a \leq m\,. \tag{1.2}$$

The

$$f_a \;:=\; e_{2a}\,, \quad 0 \leq a \leq m\,,$$

form a basis of of the complex vector space W.

Remark 1.3. At times we will find it most convenient to work with the frame e, while at other times the frame f is better suited to the computation at hand. For this reason we will develop both perspectives in the sections below. See also Remark 2.10.

Define $\mathfrak{gl}(V, \mathsf{J}) := \{X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V) \mid X\mathsf{J} = \mathsf{J}X\} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}(W)$. Let $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ be given by a matrix (X^j_k) with respect to the basis $(e_0, \ldots, e_{n+1})$. Then $X \in \mathfrak{gl}(V, \mathsf{J})$ if and only if

$$X^{2a}_{2b} \;=\; X^{2a+1}_{2b+1} \quad \text{and} \quad X^{2a}_{2b+1} \;=\; -X^{2a+1}_{2b}\,. \tag{1.4}$$

In this case, as an element of $\mathfrak{gl}(W)$, X is given by the matrix (Y^a_b),

$$Y^a_b \;=\; X^{2a}_{2b} + \mathrm{i}X^{2a+1}_{2b} \tag{1.5}$$

with respect to the basis $(f_0, \ldots, f_m)$ of W.

2. Frame bundles

2.1. **Frame bundle over $\mathbb{P}W$.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the set of frames (or bases) $e = (e_0, \ldots, e_{n+1})$ of V satisfying (1.2). If we fix a frame, then $\mathcal{F}$ may be identified with $\mathrm{GL}(V, \mathsf{J}) \simeq \mathrm{GL}(W)$. Given $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$, let $L_A : \mathrm{GL}(W) \to \mathrm{GL}(W)$ denote left-multiplication by A. Let $\pi : \mathrm{GL}(W) \to \mathbb{P}W$ denote the projection $\pi(e) = [e_0]$. Then the diagram below commutes.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{GL}(W) \arrow[r, "L_A"] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & \mathrm{GL}(W) \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
\mathbb{P}W \arrow[r, "A"] & \mathbb{P}W
\end{tikzcd}$$

2.1.1. *The Maurer-Cartan form.* The $\mathfrak{gl}(V, \mathsf{J})$–valued Maurer-Cartan 1-form $\omega = (\omega^j_k)$ on $\mathcal{F}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{d}\, e_j \;=\; \omega^k_j\, e_k\,. \tag{2.1}$$

It is straight-forward to check that ω is left-invariant:

$$L_A^* \omega \;=\; \omega\,, \tag{2.2}$$

for all $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$. We also have the *Maurer-Cartan equation*

$$\mathrm{d}\omega^j_k \;=\; -\omega^j_\ell \wedge \omega^\ell_k\,, \tag{2.3}$$

and, by (1.2),

$$\omega^{2a}_{2b} \;=\; \omega^{2a+1}_{2b+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{2a}_{2b+1} \;=\; -\omega^{2a+1}_{2b}\,. \tag{2.4}$$

If

$$\Omega^b_a \;:=\; \omega^{2b}_{2a} \;+\; \mathrm{i}\,\omega^{2b+1}_{2a}\,, \tag{2.5}$$

then

$$\mathrm{d}f_a \;=\; \Omega^b_a f_b \tag{2.6}$$

and we have the *Maurer-Cartan equation*

$$\mathrm{d}\Omega^b_a \;=\; -\Omega^b_c \wedge \Omega^c_a\,. \tag{2.7}$$

In particular, $\Omega = (\Omega^a_b)$ is the $\mathfrak{gl}(W)$–valued Maurer-Cartan form. In analogy with (2.2) we have

$$L_A^* \Omega \;=\; \Omega\,. \tag{2.8}$$

For later convenience we note that

$$\omega^{2b}_{2a} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2}(\Omega^b_a + \bar\Omega^b_a)\,, \qquad \omega^{2b+1}_{2a} \;=\; -\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}(\Omega^b_a - \bar\Omega^b_a)\,. \tag{2.9}$$

Remark 2.10. As a follow up to Remark 1.3 we note that generally the $\mathfrak{gl}(W)$–valued Maurer-Cartan form Ω is more convenient in computations. However, we found that the $\mathfrak{gl}(V, \mathsf{J})$–valued ω has the advantage of yielding a general formula for the k-th order differential invariants (Proposition 3.6). So we will continue to work with both, favoring the more convenient form for the computation at hand, and often giving equivalent statements for each.

2.1.2. *Change of frame.* It will be necessary to understand how Ω varies under a change of frame. Consider a smooth map $g = (g^a_b) : \mathcal{F} \to \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}\mathbb{C}$. Let $\tilde{f}_a = g^b_a(f) f_b$. This map induces $G : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$ by mapping the frame $f = (f_a)$ to the frame $G(f) = (g^b_a(f) f_b) = \tilde{f}$. Let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ denote the pull-back $G^*(\Omega_{\tilde{f}})$. Then (2.6) yields

$$\widetilde{\Omega}^b_a \;=\; (g^{-1})^b_c \, \mathrm{d}g^c_a \;+\; (g^{-1})^b_c \, \Omega^c_d \, g^d_a \,. \tag{2.11}$$

2.2. **Frame bundle over a CR–hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}W$.** Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ be a CR–hypersurface. Let $\widehat{S} := \{ v \in V \backslash \{0\} \mid [v] \in S \}$ denote the cone over S. Then $\widehat{S}$ is a CR–hypersurface in (V, J). If $z = [e_0] \in S$, let $\widehat{T}_z S \subset V$ be the $(n+1)$–plane tangent to $\widehat{S}$ at e_0. (We distinguish the linear subspace $\widehat{T}_z S$ from the intrinsic tangent space $T_{e_0}\widehat{S}$.) Define

$$\mathcal{F}_S \;:=\; \{ (e_0, \ldots, e_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{F} \mid z = [e_0] \in S \,,\ \mathrm{span}\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\} = \widehat{T}_z S \} \,.$$

Remark 2.12. Given $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$, notice that $L_A(\mathcal{F}_S) = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ where $\widetilde{S} = A(S) = \pi \circ L_A(\mathcal{F}_S)$. In particular, two CR-hypersurfaces $S, \widetilde{S} \subset \mathbb{P}W$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}} = L_A(\mathcal{F}_S)$.

The key ingredient in the solution of the projective equivalence problem is the following.

Proposition 2.13. *Two CR-hypersurface $S, \widetilde{S} \subset \mathbb{P}W$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that $\phi^*(\Omega_{|\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \Omega_{|\mathcal{F}_S}$. (Equivalently, $\phi^*(\omega_{|\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \omega_{|\mathcal{F}_S}$.)*

The proof of the proposition makes use of the following well-known theorem of E. Cartan.

Theorem 2.14 (Cartan [10, Theorem 1.6.10])**.** *let G be a Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and Maurer-Cartan form ϑ. Let M be a manifold with a $\mathfrak{g}$–valued 1-form η satisfying the Maurer-Cartan equation $\mathrm{d}\eta = -[\eta, \eta]$. Then for any $p \in M$ there exists a neighborhood U and a map $f : U \to G$ such that $f^*\vartheta = \eta$. Moreover any two such maps $f_1, f_2 : U \to G$ are related by $f_2 = L_g \circ f_1$ for some $g \in G$.*

Remark. In the case that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a matrix Lie algebra, $\mathrm{d}\eta = -[\eta, \eta]$ is (2.3).

Proof of Proposition 2.13. The proposition follows directly from Theorem 2.14 by taking $G = \mathrm{GL}(W)$ and $\vartheta = \Omega$ with $M = \mathcal{F}_S$ and $\eta = \Omega_{|\mathcal{F}_S}$, f_1 the inclusion map and $f_2 = \phi$. □

Consider the pull-back of the Maurer-Cartan form to $\mathcal{F}_S$. By construction $\{ \mathrm{d}e_0(\xi) \mid \xi \in T_v\mathcal{F}_S \} = \mathrm{span}\{e_0, \ldots, e_n\}$ so that the $\omega^0_0, \omega^1_0, \ldots, \omega^n_0$ are linearly independent on $\mathcal{F}_S$, and

$$\omega^{n+1}_0 \;=\; 0 \qquad \overset{(2.9)}{\Longleftrightarrow} \qquad \Omega^m_0 \;-\; \bar{\Omega}^m_0 \;=\; 0 \,. \tag{2.15}$$

Definition. A tangent vector $v \in T\mathcal{F}_S$ is *vertical* if $\pi_*(v) = 0$, where $\pi : \mathcal{F}_S \to S$ is the natural projection. A 1-form ϱ on $\mathcal{F}_S$ is *semi-basic* if $\varrho(v) = 0$ for all vertical $v \in T\mathcal{F}_S$.

Remark 2.16. The equation $\mathrm{d}e_0 = \omega^j_0 e_j$ implies that the linearly independent $\omega^2_0, \ldots, \omega^n_0$ span the semi-basic 1-forms. Equivalently, 1-forms Ω^α_0, $\bar{\Omega}^\alpha_0$ and Ω^m_0 are linearly independent on $\mathcal{F}_S$ and span the semi-basic 1-forms (as a real vector space).

3. Projective differential invariants w.r.t ω

3.1. **Definition and construction.** An application of the Maurer-Cartan equation (2.3) to (2.15) yields

$$0 \;=\; -\mathrm{d}\omega_0^{n+1} \;=\; \omega_1^{n+1}\wedge\omega_0^1 \;+\; \omega_2^{n+1}\wedge\omega_0^2 \;+\;\cdots\;+\; \omega_n^{n+1}\wedge\omega_0^n\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Recall that the $\omega_0^1,\ldots,\omega_0^n$ are linearly independent on $\mathcal{F}_S$, by Remark 2.16. The following lemma is well-known.

Lemma 3.2 (Cartan's Lemma [2, 10] for ω)**.** *Suppose there exist real-valued 1-forms* $\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_n$ *on* $\mathcal{F}_S$ *such that* $\xi_s\wedge\omega_0^s = 0$*. Then there exist functions* $H_{st} = H_{ts} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$*,* $1 \le s,t \le n$*, such that*

$$\xi_s \;=\; H_{st}\,\omega_0^t\,.$$

Lemma 3.2 and (3.1) imply there exist functions $h_{st} = h_{ts} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$, $1 \le s,t \le n$, such that

$$\omega_s^{n+1} \;=\; h_{st}\,\omega_0^t\,,\ 1 \le s \le n\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Note that $\omega_0^n \overset{(2.4)}{=} \omega_1^{n+1} = h_{1s}\,\omega_0^s$. This forces

$$h_{1s} \;=\; h_{s1} \;=\; 0\,,\ \forall\, s < n\,, \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_{1n} \;=\; h_{n1} \;=\; 1\,. \tag{3.4}$$

The $h^{(2)} = \{h_{st}\}$ are second-order projective differential invariants: they describe the second-order differential geometry of S at $z = [e_0]$; see Section 3.2 for more detail. The $\{h_{\sigma\tau}\} \subset h^{(2)}$ are the coefficients of the CR second fundamental form; see Section 4.3.

We repeat the process above to obtain third-order invariants: apply the Maurer-Cartan equation (2.3) to differentiate (3.3). An application of Cartan's Lemma 3.2 to the resulting 2-form yields functions $h_{rst} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$ that are fully symmetric in the indices such that

$$\mathrm{d}h_{rs} \;+\; h_{rs}\,(\omega_0^0 + \omega_{n+1}^{n+1}) \;-\; h_{rt}\,\omega_s^t \;-\; h_{ts}\,\omega_r^t \;=\; h_{rst}\,\omega_0^t\,. \tag{3.5}$$

The together the coefficients $h^{(2)} = \{h_{st}\}$ and $h^{(3)} = \{h_{rst}\}$ describe the geometry of S to third order. See §3.2.

Continuing inductively one may deduce a general formula (Proposition 3.6) for the $(p{+}1)$-st order invariants $h_{s_1\cdots s_p t}$. First some notation: given two tensors $T_{s_1\ldots s_p}$ and $U_{s_{p+1}\ldots s_{p+q}}$, let S_{p+q} denote the symmetric group on $p+q$ letters. Let

$$T_{(s_1\ldots s_p}U_{s_{p+1}\ldots s_{p+q})} \;=\; \frac{1}{(p+q)!}\sum_{\sigma\in S_{p+q}} T_{\sigma(a_1)\ldots\sigma(s_p)}U_{\sigma(s_{p+1})\ldots\sigma(s_{p+q})}$$

denote the *symmetrization* of their product. For example, $T_{(s_1}U_{s_2)} = \frac{1}{2}(T_{s_1}U_{s_2} + T_{s_2}U_{s_1})$. We exclude from the symmetrization operation any index that is outside the parentheses. For example, in $h_{t(s_1\ldots s_{p-1}}\,\omega_{s_p)}^t$ we symmetrize over only the s_i, excluding the t index.

Proposition 3.6. *Set $h_s = 0$ and assume $p > 1$. There exist functions $h_{s_1 \cdots s_p t} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$, fully symmetric in their indices, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} h_{s_1 \ldots s_p t}\, \omega^t_0 \;&=\; \mathrm{d}h_{s_1 \ldots s_p} \,+\, (p-1)\, h_{s_1 \ldots s_p}\, \omega^0_0 \,+\, h_{s_1 \ldots s_p}\, \omega^{n+1}_{n+1} \\ &\quad + p\, \left\{ (p-2)\, h_{(s_1 \ldots s_{p-1}} \omega^0_{s_p)} \,-\, h_{t(s_1 \ldots s_{p-1}}\, \omega^t_{s_p)} \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \tbinom{p}{j} \left\{ (j-1)\, h_{(s_1 \ldots s_j}\, h_{s_{j+1} \ldots s_p)}\, \omega^0_{n+1} \,-\, h_{t(s_1 \ldots s_j}\, h_{s_{j+1} \ldots s_p)}\, \omega^t_{n+1} \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Definition. We let $h^{(p)} = \{h_{s_1 \cdots s_p}\}$ denote the p-th order coefficients; and $h = \cup\, h^{(p)}$ denote the complete set of coefficients.

Remark 3.7. The h are projective invariants. To be precise, suppose that $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$. Let $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ and set $\widetilde{S} = A(S)$. Then $\tilde{e} = L_A(e) \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ by Remark 2.12. From Proposition 3.6 and the left-invariance (2.2) of ω, we see that $h(e) = h(\tilde{e})$. Thus h is invariant under projective transformation. In Proposition 3.11 we show that, for fixed $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$, the coefficients $h(e)$ characterize an analytic CR-hypersurface up to projective transformation.

Remark. The coefficients h are the CR–analogs of the coefficients of the Fubini forms of a complex subvariety of $\mathbb{P}W$, cf. [10, Chapter 3].

Definition. In this setting, we say two CR-hypersurfaces $S, \widetilde{S} \subset \mathbb{P}W$ *agree to order* $p \geq 1$ if there exists a bundle map $\phi : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ with the property that $\omega^\sigma_0 = \phi^* \widetilde{\sigma}^\sigma_0$, $\omega^n_0 = \phi^* \widetilde{\omega}^n_0$ (first-order agreement) and $\phi^* \widetilde{h}^{(q)} = h^{(q)}$ for all $2 \leq q \leq p$.

Remark 3.8. This is a considerably weaker condition than Jensen's notion of p-th order projective deformation when $p \geq 2$. For example, in our case second order agreement is equivalent to $\omega^\sigma_0 = \phi^* \widetilde{\omega}^\sigma_0$, $\omega^n_0 = \phi^* \widetilde{\omega}^n_0$ and $\omega^{n+1}_s = \phi^* \widetilde{\omega}^{n+1}_s$. Jensen's condition that S and $\widetilde{S}$ be second-order projective deformations of each other includes the additional relations $\Omega^a_b = \phi^* \widetilde{\Omega}^a_b$, with $1 \leq a, b \leq m$. Differentiating Jensen's second-order equations yields $\omega = \phi^* \widetilde{\omega}$ which implies that S and $\widetilde{S}$ are projectively equivalent. See [12].

Proof of Proposition 3.6. From (3.5) we see that Proposition 3.6 holds for $p = 2$. Differentiating (3.5) and applying Cartan's Lemma 3.2 yields functions $h_{rstu} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$, completely symmetric in their indices, such that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{rstu}\, \omega^u_0 \;&=\; \mathrm{d}h_{rst} \,+\, h_{rst}\, (2\, \omega^0_0 + \omega^{n+1}_{n+1}) \,-\, h_{ust}\, \omega^u_r \,-\, h_{rut}\, \omega^u_s \,-\, h_{rsu}\, \omega^u_t \\ &\quad + h_{rs}\, \omega^0_t \,+\, h_{st}\, \omega^0_r \,+\, h_{tr}\, \omega^0_s \,-\, (h_{rs}\, h_{tu} \,+\, h_{st}\, h_{ru} \,+\, h_{tr}\, h_{su})\, \omega^u_{n+1} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

This establishes Proposition 3.6 in the case $p = 3$. The general case may not be established by induction on p. Details are left to the reader. ☐

3.2. **Local coordinate computation.** In this section we give a local coordinate computation of h_{st} at a point $w_o \in S$. Given $w_o = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in S$ fix coordinates $z = (z^1, \ldots, z^m) \mapsto [1 : z^1 : \cdots : z^m]$ on $\mathbb{P}W$ in a neighborhood of w_o so that S is locally given as a graph

$$y^m \;=\; f(z^1, \bar{z}^1, \ldots, z^{m-1}, \bar{z}^{m-1}, x^m) \;=\; f(x^1, y^1, \ldots, x^{m-1}, y^{m-1}, x^m) \,, \quad z^j = x^j + \mathrm{i}\, y^j \,,$$

over its (real) tangent space $T_pS = \{y^m = 0\}$. Fix the index range $0 < \alpha, \beta < m$. Locally the tangent space is spanned by

$$\mathsf{e}_{2\alpha} \;=\; \partial_{x^\alpha} \;+\; f_{x^\alpha}\,\partial_{y^m}\,, \quad \mathsf{e}_{2\alpha+1} \;=\; \partial_{y^\alpha} \;+\; f_{y^\alpha}\,\partial_{y^m}\,, \quad \mathsf{e}_{2m} \;=\; \partial_{x^m} \;+\; f_{x^m}\,\partial_{y^m}\,.$$

The vector $\mathsf{e}_{2m+1} = \mathsf{J}\mathsf{e}_{2m} = \partial_{y^m} - f_{x^m}\partial_{x^m}$ completes the local framing of the tangent space to a framing of $\mathbb{C}^m$ (as a real vector space). If we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{e}_0 \;&=\; \partial_{x^0} \;+\; x^\alpha\,\partial_{x^\alpha} \;+\; y^\alpha\,\partial_{y^\alpha} \;+\; x^m\,\partial_{x^m} \;+\; f\,\partial_{y^m} \\ \mathsf{e}_1 \;=\; \mathsf{J}\mathsf{e}_0 \;&=\; \partial_{y^0} \;-\; y^\alpha\,\partial_{x^\alpha} \;+\; x^\alpha\,\partial_{y^\alpha} \;+\; x^m\,\partial_{y^m} \;-\; f\,\partial_{x^m} \end{aligned}$$

then we may regard $\mathsf{e} = (\mathsf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathsf{e}_{2m+1})$ as framing of V. However this frame does not satisfy (1.2). We modify e as follows. Set

$$e_0 \;=\; \mathsf{e}_0\,, \quad e_1 \;=\; \mathsf{e}_1\,, \quad e_{2m} \;=\mathsf{e}_{2m}\,, \quad e_{2m+1} \;=\; \mathsf{e}_{2m+1}\,.$$

Let $\delta = 1/(1 + {f_{x^m}}^2)$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} e_{2\alpha} \;&=\; \mathsf{e}_{2a} \;+\; \delta\,(f_{y^\alpha} - f_{x^a} f_{x^m})\,\mathsf{e}_{2m} \\ &=\; \partial_{x^\alpha} \;+\; \delta\,(f_{y^\alpha} - f_{x^\alpha} f_{x^m})\partial_{x^m} \;+\; \delta\,(f_{x^\alpha} + f_{y^\alpha} f_{x^m})\partial_{y^m}\,, \\ e_{2\alpha+1} \;&=\; \mathsf{e}_{2\alpha+1} \;-\; \delta\,(f_{x^\alpha} + f_{y^a} f_{x^m})\,\mathsf{e}_{2m} \\ &=\; \partial_{y^\alpha} \;-\; \delta\,(f_{x^\alpha} + f_{y^\alpha} f_{x^m})\partial_{x^m} \;+\; \delta\,(f_{y^\alpha} - f_{x^\alpha} f_{x^m})\partial_{y^m}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Then $e = (e_0, \ldots, e_{2m+1})$ is a local section of $\mathcal{F}_S$. The dual coframe is $e^0 = \mathrm{d}x^0$, $e^1 = \mathrm{d}x^1$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{2a} \;&=\; \mathrm{d}x^a \;-\; x^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}x^0 \;+\; y^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}y^0\,, \quad e^{2a+1} \;=\; \mathrm{d}y^a \;-\; y^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}x^0 \;-\; x^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}y^0\,, \\ e^{2m} \;&=\; \mathrm{d}x^m \;-\; x^m\,\mathrm{d}x^0 \;+\; f\,\mathrm{d}y^0 \;-\; \delta\,(f_{y^\alpha} - f_{x^\alpha} f_{x^m})\,\mathrm{d}x^\alpha \;+\; \delta\,(f_{x^\alpha} + f_{y^\alpha} f_{x^m})\,\mathrm{d}y^\alpha \\ e^{2m+1} \;&=\; \mathrm{d}y^m \;-\; f\,\mathrm{d}x^0 \;-\; x^m\,\mathrm{d}y^0 \;-\; \delta\,(f_{x^\alpha} + f_{y^\alpha} f_{x^m})\,\mathrm{d}x^\alpha \;-\; \delta\,(f_{y^\alpha} - f_{x^\alpha} f_{x^m})\,\mathrm{d}y^\alpha\,. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, at $z(w_o) = 0$ we have $f = 0 = \mathrm{d}f$, where the last equality follows from the fact that the coordinates locally realize S as a graph over its tangent space at w_o. Differentiating at w_o yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}e_0 \;&=\; \mathrm{d}x^\alpha\,e_{2\alpha} + \mathrm{d}y^\alpha\,e_{2\alpha+1} + \mathrm{d}x^m\,e_n\,, \quad \mathrm{d}e_1 \;=\; -\mathrm{d}y^\alpha\,e_{2\alpha} + \mathrm{d}x^\alpha\,e_{2\alpha+1} + \mathrm{d}x^m\,e_{n+1}\,, \\ \mathrm{d}e_{2\alpha} \;&=\; \mathrm{d}f_{y^\alpha}\,e_n \;+\; \mathrm{d}f_{x^\alpha}\,e_{n+1}\,, \quad \mathrm{d}e_{2\alpha+1} \;=\; -\mathrm{d}f_{x^\alpha}\,e_n \;+\; \mathrm{d}f_{y^\alpha}\,e_{n+1}\,, \\ \mathrm{d}e_{2m} \;&=\; \mathrm{d}f_{x^m}\,e_{n+1}\,, \quad \mathrm{d}e_{2m+1} = = \; -\mathrm{d}f_{x^m}\,e_n\,. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.1) we see that, under pulled-back by the section e, the only nonzero components ω^j_k of the Maurer-Cartan form are

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega^{2\alpha}_0 \;=\; \mathrm{d}x^\alpha\,, \quad \omega^{2\alpha}_1 \;=\; -\mathrm{d}y^\alpha\,, \quad \omega^{2\alpha+1}_0 \;=\; \mathrm{d}y^\alpha\,, \quad \omega^{2\alpha+1}_1 \;=\; \mathrm{d}x^\alpha\,, \\ &\omega^n_0 \;=\; \mathrm{d}x^m\,, \quad \omega^n_{2\beta} \;=\; \mathrm{d}f_{y^\beta}\,, \quad \omega^n_{2\beta+1} \;=\; -\mathrm{d}f_{x^\beta}\,, \quad \omega^n_{n+1} \;=\; -\mathrm{d}f_{x^m}\,, \\ &\omega^{n+1}_1 \;=\; \mathrm{d}x^m\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_{2\beta} \;=\; \mathrm{d}f_{x^\beta}\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_{2\beta+1} \;=\; \mathrm{d}f_{y^\beta}\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_n \;=\; \mathrm{d}f_{x^m}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (3.3) yields (again, at $z(w_o) = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} h_{2\alpha,2\beta} \;&=\; f_{x^\alpha x^\beta}\,, \quad h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1} \;=\; f_{x^\alpha y^\beta}\,, \quad h_{2\alpha,n} \;=\; f_{x^\alpha x^m}\,, \\ h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1} \;&=\; f_{y^\alpha y^\beta}\,, \quad h_{2\alpha+1,n} \;=\; f_{y^\alpha x^m}\,, \quad h_{n,n} \;=\; f_{x^m x^m}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

To be precise, the coefficients h on the left are evaluated at $e(w_o) \in \mathcal{F}_S$, and the derivatives on the right are evaluated at $z(w_o) = 0$. More generally, for $p > 1$, Proposition 3.6 yields

$$h_{s_1 \ldots s_p t}\, \omega^t_0 \ = \ \mathrm{d}h_{s_1 \ldots s_p} \ - \ p\, h_{t(s_1 \ldots s_{p-1}}\, \omega^t_{s_p)} \ - \ \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \tbinom{p}{j}\, h_{n(s_1 \ldots s_j}\, h_{s_{j+1} \ldots s_p)}\, \mathrm{d}f_{x^m} \, .$$

In the case that none of the indices are equal to 1, we see that $h_{s_1 \cdots s_p t}$ is a $(p{+}1)$-st derivative of f, modulo terms involving lower over derivatives. This is why we refer to the $h_{s_1 \cdots s_p}$ as p-th order invariants. Moreover, given the $h_{s_1 \cdots s_p}$ we may recover the partial derivatives of f at 0 and therefore the hypersurface S (assuming S is real analytic). That is, a connected, analytic S is completely determined by $h(e)$.

The frame $e(w_o)$ over w_o is not unique in this respect. Given second frame $\tilde{e}$ over w_o, it is always possible to find a local section of the form above through $\tilde{e}$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $S, \widetilde{S} \subset \mathbb{P}W$ be two connected, analytic CR-hypersurfaces. Then there exists a complex projective linear transformation $A : \mathbb{P}W \to \mathbb{P}W$ such that $A(S) = \widetilde{S}$ if and only if there exist frames $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$ and $\tilde{e} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that $h(e) = \widetilde{h}(\tilde{e})$.*

Remark. In Section §3.3 we will show that the $h_{s_1 \cdots s_p}$ with some $s_i = 1$ are redundant.

Proof. Let $A : \mathbb{P}W \to \mathbb{P}W$ be an invertible projective linear transformation, and let $L_A : \mathrm{GL}(W) \to \mathrm{GL}(W)$ denote the lift (left multiplication) to $\mathrm{GL}(W)$. If A maps S to $\widetilde{S}$, then the lift L_A maps $\mathcal{F}_S$ to $\mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$. Given $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$, let $\tilde{e} = \widetilde{A}(e)$. Then (2.2) and Proposition 3.6 yield $h(e) = h(\tilde{e})$.

Conversely, suppose that $h(e) = h(\tilde{e})$ for some frames $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$ and $\tilde{e} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$. Define $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ by $Ae = \tilde{e}$. Then $A(S)$ and $\widetilde{S}$ agree to infinite order at $\tilde{e}$. It follows from the discussion preceding the lemma that $A(S) = \widetilde{S}$. □

3.3. Redundancy of the index 1 in *h*.

The alert reader will have noticed that (2.4) allows us to write (3.1) as

$$0 \ = \ \omega^{n+1}_2 \wedge \omega^2_0 \ + \ \cdots \ + \ \omega^{n+1}_{n-1} \wedge \omega^{n-1}_0 \ + \ (\omega^{n+1}_n - \omega^1_0) \wedge \omega^n_0$$

Cartan's Lemma then yields a smaller set of second-order invariants $\{h_{st} \mid 2 \le s,t \le n\}$, defined by $\omega^{n+1}_\sigma = h_{\sigma t}\, \omega^\tau_0$ and $\omega^{n+1}_n - \omega^1_0 = h_{nt}\, \omega^t_0$, $2 \le t \le n$. That is, the coefficients of $h^{(2)}$ with some index equal to 1 are redundant.

This pattern continues. First define

$$J^{2\alpha}_{2\beta} \ := \ 0 \ =: \ J^{2\alpha+1}_{2\beta+1} \, , \quad J^{2\alpha+1}_{2\beta} \ := \ \delta^\alpha_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad J^{2\alpha}_{2\beta+1} \ := \ -\delta^\alpha_\beta \, .$$

Then $J^\sigma_\nu\, J^\nu_\tau = -\delta^\sigma_\tau$, and (2.4) and Corollary 5.5 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^\sigma_1 \ &= \ J^\sigma_\tau\, \omega^\tau_0 \, , & \omega^1_\sigma \ &= \ -J^\tau_\sigma\, \omega^0_\tau \, , & \omega^0_\sigma \ &= \ J^\tau_\sigma\, \omega^1_\tau \, , \\ \omega^n_\sigma \ &= \ J^\nu_\sigma\, h_{\nu\tau}\, \omega^\tau_0 \, , & \omega^\sigma_{n+1} \ &= \ J^\sigma_\tau\, \omega^\tau_n \, , & \omega^\sigma_\tau \ &= \ -J^\sigma_\mu\, \omega^\mu_\nu\, J^\nu_\tau \, . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

To see that the third-order invariants h_{rst} with some index equal to 1 are redundant differentiate $0 = h_{11} = h_{1\sigma}$ and $h_{1n} = 1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= h_{11s} = h_{1nn}\,, \\ h_{1\sigma n} &= -J^\tau_\sigma\, h_{\tau n}\,, \\ h_{1\sigma\tau} &= -J^\nu_\sigma\, h_{\nu\tau} - J^\nu_\tau\, h_{\sigma\nu}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

The general observation may be established by induction: Define

$$1^{\mathsf{a}}\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_p n^{\mathsf{b}} := \underbrace{1\cdots1}_{\mathsf{a}\ 1'\mathrm{s}}\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_p\underbrace{n\cdots n}_{\mathsf{b}\ n'\mathrm{s}}\,.$$

Assume that there exists $r_o \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that every $h_{1^{\mathsf{a}}\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_p n^{\mathsf{b}}} \in \{h^{(r)} \mid r \le r_o\}$ with $\mathsf{a} > 0$ is a linear combination of the $\{h_{\tau_1\cdots\tau_p n^{\mathsf{b}}}\}$. Above we saw that this is the case for $r_o = 2, 3$. Then a computation with Proposition 3.6 that makes use of (2.4) and (3.12) will show that every $h_{1^{\mathsf{a}}\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_p n^{\mathsf{b}}} \in h^{(r_o+1)}$ with $\mathsf{a} > 0$ is a linear combination of the $\{h_{\tau_1\cdots\tau_p n^{\mathsf{b}}}\}$. Details are left to the reader. As a corollary to Lemma 3.11 we have the following.

Corollary 3.14. *The $h_o = \{h_{\sigma_1\cdots\sigma_p n^{\mathsf{b}}}\}$ form a complete set of projective differential invariants for an analytic CR-hypersurface. That is, two hypersurfaces S and $\widetilde{S}$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists $e \in \mathcal{F}_S$ and $\tilde{e} \in \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that $h_o(e) = h_o(\tilde{e})$.*

We close the section by pointing out that, while the $h_{1^{\mathsf{a}}\tau_1\cdots\tau_p n^{\mathsf{b}}}$ with $\mathsf{a} > 0$ are redundant, they are very convenient for computations; the formulation of Proposition 3.6 would not be so tidy without them. Indeed we discern no analogous general expression for the differential invariants with respect to Ω.

4. PROJECTIVE DIFFERENTIAL INVARIANTS W.R.T. Ω

4.1. **Second-order invariants.** By Remark 2.16 the $\{\Omega^\alpha_m, \bar\Omega^\alpha_m, \Omega^m_0\}$ span the semi-basic forms on $\mathcal{F}_S$. The Ω-version of Cartan's Lemma is as follows.

Lemma 4.1 (Cartan's Lemma [2, 10] for Ω)**.** *Suppose there exist complex-valued 1-forms ζ_α, $\zeta_{\bar\alpha}$ and ζ_m on $\mathcal{F}_S$ such that $\zeta_\alpha \wedge \Omega^\alpha_0 + \zeta_{\bar\alpha} \wedge \bar\Omega^\alpha_0 + \zeta_m \wedge \Omega^m_0 = 0$. Then there exist functions $Z_{\alpha\beta}, Z_{\alpha\bar\beta}, Z_{\bar\alpha\beta}, Z_{\bar\alpha\bar\beta}, Z_\alpha, Z_{\bar\alpha}, Z : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_\alpha &= Z_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_0 + Z_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_0 + Z_\alpha\,\Omega^m_0\,, \\ \zeta_{\bar\alpha} &= Z_{\bar\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_0 + Z_{\bar\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_0 + Z_{\bar\alpha}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \\ \zeta_m &= Z_\beta\,\Omega^\beta_0 + Z_{\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_0 + Z\,\Omega^m_0\,, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = Z_{\beta\alpha}\,, \quad Z_{\alpha\bar\beta} = Z_{\bar\beta\alpha}\,, \quad Z_{\bar\alpha\bar\beta} = Z_{\bar\beta\bar\alpha}\,.$$

Recall that (2.15) holds on $\mathcal{F}_S$. Differentiating with the Maurer-Cartan equation (2.7), we obtain

$$0 = \mathrm{d}\,(\Omega^m_0 - \bar\Omega^m_0) = (\Omega^0_0 + \bar\Omega^m_m - \bar\Omega^0_0 - \Omega^m_m) \wedge \Omega^m_0 - \Omega^m_\alpha \wedge \Omega^\alpha_0 + \bar\Omega^m_\alpha \wedge \bar\Omega^\alpha_0\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Note that $\Omega^0_0 + \bar\Omega^m_m - \bar\Omega^0_0 - \Omega^m_m$ takes values in $\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$. So Lemma 4.1 yields functions $P_{\alpha\beta} = P_{\beta\alpha}$, $\bar P_{\alpha\bar\beta} = -P_{\beta\bar\alpha}$, $P_{\alpha m}$, $P_{mm} = -\bar P_{mm} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\Omega^m_\alpha \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha m}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \tag{4.3a}$$

$$(\Omega^0_0 \;+\; \bar\Omega^m_m) \;-\; (\bar\Omega^0_0 \;+\; \Omega^m_m) \;=\; -P_{\alpha m}\,\Omega^\alpha_0 \;+\; \bar P_{\alpha m}\,\bar\Omega^\alpha_0 \;+\; P_{mm}\,\Omega^m_0\,. \tag{4.3b}$$

Making use of (2.4), (2.5), (2.9), (3.3) and (4.3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha\beta} &= \tfrac12\,(h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1} + h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta}) \;+\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\,(h_{2\alpha,2\beta} - h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1}),\\ P_{\alpha\bar\beta} &= \tfrac12\,(h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta} - h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1}) \;+\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\,(h_{2\alpha,2\beta} + h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1})\,,\\ P_{\alpha m} &= h_{n,2\alpha+1} \;+\; \mathrm{i}\,h_{n,2\alpha}\,,\\ P_{mm} &= -2\mathrm{i}\,h_{nn}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

In particular, the coefficients on the right-hand side of (4.3) are the second-order differential invariants on $\mathcal{F}_S$. Indeed, the $-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ are the coefficients of the *Levi form* in a local coordinate frame. See Section 4.2. (In an abuse of language we will often refer to $P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ as the coefficients of the Levi form.) The frame bundle $\mathcal{F}_S$ admits a sub-bundle $\mathcal{P}_S$ on which the $P_{\alpha m}$ and P_{mm} vanish; see Lemma 5.1.

Remark. Together the $P_{\alpha\beta}$ and $P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ may be identified with the derivative of a Gauss map (see Section 6.1). The are, respectively, the anti-hermitian and hermitian parts of the CR second fundamental form.

4.2. **Local coordinate computation.** Here we convert the expressions of §3.2 to z and $\bar z$ derivatives. Recall $\partial_z = \frac12(\partial_x - \mathrm{i}\partial_y)$ and $\partial_{\bar z} = \frac12(\partial_x + \mathrm{i}\partial_y)$, so that (3.10) and (4.4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} f_{z^\alpha z^\beta} &= \tfrac14\,(f_{x^\alpha x^\beta} - f_{y^\alpha y^\beta}) \;-\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{4}\,(f_{x^\alpha y^\beta} + f_{y^\alpha x^\beta}) \;=\; -\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P_{\alpha\beta}\,,\\ f_{z^\alpha \bar z^\beta} &= \tfrac14\,(f_{x^\alpha x^\beta} + f_{y^\alpha y^\beta}) \;+\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{4}\,(f_{x^\alpha y^\beta} - f_{y^\alpha x^\beta}) \;=\; -\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\,P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

So we have the power series representation for $y^m = f$ at p,

$$\begin{aligned} y^m &= h_{2\alpha,2\beta}\,x^\alpha x^\beta \;+\; 2\,h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1}\,x^\alpha y^\beta \;+\; h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1}\,y^\alpha y^\beta \;+\; \Delta\\ &= \tfrac14(h_{2\alpha,2\beta} - h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1} - 2\,\mathrm{i}\,h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1})\,z^\alpha z^\beta\\ &\quad + \tfrac12(h_{2\alpha,2\beta} + h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1} + \mathrm{i}\,(h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1} - h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta}))\,z^\alpha \bar z^\beta\\ &\quad + \tfrac14(h_{2\alpha,2\beta} - h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1} + 2\,\mathrm{i}\,h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1})\,\bar z^\alpha \bar z^\beta \;+\; \Delta\\ &= -\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P_{\alpha\beta}z^\alpha z^\beta \;-\; \mathrm{i}\,P_{\alpha\bar\beta}z^\alpha\bar z^\beta \;+\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\bar P_{\alpha\beta}\bar z^\alpha\bar z^\beta \;+\; \Delta\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where Δ denotes the terms of degree greater than two, as well as the quadratic terms involving x^m.

Definition. From (4.5) we see that $-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ is the *Levi form.*

Remark. Classically, *strong pseudoconvexity* is the condition that the Levi form be negative definite. If we replace e_0 with $-e_0$, then the coefficients $P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ change sign. So when working on the frame bundle $\mathcal{F}_S$ we will define S to be strongly pseudoconvex if the coefficients $P_{\alpha\bar\beta} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{C}$ define a definite form.

Definition 4.7. A strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface S is *strongly* $\mathbb{C}$*-linearly convex* (SCLC) if *no* real line tangent to $\widehat{H}_z S$ makes second order contact with $\widehat{S}$ at $w \in \hat{z}$.

Let $\mathsf{z} = (\mathsf{z}^1, \dots, \mathsf{z}^{m-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$. Define $P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z}) = P_{\alpha\beta}\mathsf{z}^\alpha\mathsf{z}^\beta$ and $L(\mathsf{z},\bar{\mathsf{z}}) = P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\mathsf{z}^\alpha\bar{\mathsf{z}}^\beta$. From (4.6) we see that the surface S is strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex if and only if

$$0 \;\neq\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z}) \;+\; \mathrm{i}L(\mathsf{z},\bar{\mathsf{z}}) \;+\; \overline{\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z})} \;=\; -\mathrm{Im}P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z}) + \mathrm{i}\,L(\mathsf{z},\bar{\mathsf{z}}) \tag{4.8}$$

for all $0 \neq \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$. Equivalently,

$$|\mathrm{Im}P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z})| < |L(\mathsf{z},\bar{\mathsf{z}})| \quad \forall\; 0 \neq \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Equation (4.8) can be expressed as

$$0 \;\neq\; \mathrm{i}\,\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{z}^t & \bar{\mathsf{z}}^t \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} P & L \\ L^t & -\bar P \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{z} \\ \bar{\mathsf{z}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.10}$$

for all $0 \neq \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$, where $P = (P_{\alpha\beta})$ and $L = (P_{\alpha\bar\beta})$. In particular the matrix above must be invertible. Indeed,

$$\begin{pmatrix} P & L \\ L^t & -\bar P \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} Q & M \\ M^t & -\bar Q \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{array}{l} Q = \overline{L^{-1}P}(P\overline{L^{-1}P} - L)^{-1}\,, \\ M = (\bar P L^{-1} P - \bar L)^{-1}\,. \end{array} \tag{4.11}$$

Note that $Q^t = Q$ and $\bar M^t = -M$.

4.3. **Second order projectively invariant tensors on S.**

In this section we illustrate the frame bundle construction of the second fundamental form of S.

Let $J_z : T_z\mathbb{P}W \to T_z\mathbb{P}W$ denote the complex structure on $\mathbb{P}W$. Given $z \in S$, let $H_z = T_zS \,\cap\, J_z(T_zS)$ denote the maximal complex subspace of T_zS. Analogously define $\widehat{H}_zS = \widehat{T}_zS \,\cap\, \mathsf{J}(\widehat{T}_zS) \subset W$. Given $z \in \mathbb{P}W$, let $\hat z = L_z \in W$ denote the corresponding (complex) line through the origin. Then

$$H_zS \;=\; L_z^* \otimes (\widehat{H}_zS/L_z)\,,$$

and $HS \to S$ defines a rank $m-1$ complex vector bundle over S. Similarly, define the normal (complex) line bundle $NS \to S$ by

$$N_zS \;=\; T_z\mathbb{P}W/H_zS \;=\; L_z^* \otimes (W/\widehat{H}_zS)\,.$$

Given $f = (f_0, \dots, f_n) \in \mathcal{F}_S$, set $z = [f_0] \in S$ and let $(f^0, \dots, f^n)$ denote the dual basis of W^*. Then $\mathsf{f}_\alpha = f^0 \otimes (f_\alpha \bmod L_z)$ defines a basis of H_zS, and $\mathsf{f}_m = f^0 \otimes (f_m \bmod \widehat{H}_zS)$ spans N_zS. Let $(\mathsf{f}^1, \dots, \mathsf{f}^{m-1})$ denote the dual basis of $H^*_zS = (H_zS)^*$. Define

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \mathbf{P}_f & = & P_{\alpha\beta}\,\mathsf{f}^\alpha\mathsf{f}^\beta \otimes \mathsf{f}_m \;\in\; (\mathrm{Sym}^2 H^*_zS) \otimes N_zS\,, & \text{and} \\ \mathbf{L}_f & = & P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\mathsf{f}^\alpha\bar{\mathsf{f}}^\beta \otimes \mathsf{f}_m \;\in\; H^*_zS \,\otimes\, \bar H^*_zS \,\otimes\, N_zS\,. & \end{array}$$

We claim that $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ descend to well-defined sections of $(\mathrm{Sym}^2 H^*) \otimes NS$ and $H^*S \otimes \bar H^*S \otimes NS$, respectively, over S. (The tensors $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ are respectively the anti-hermitian and hermitian parts of the second fundamental form of S.) To establish the claim it suffices to show that $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ are constant on fibres of $\mathcal{F}_S$. This is seen as follows.

First consider a change of frame (§2.1.2) of the form

$$\tilde f_0 \;=\; g^0_0\, f_0\,, \quad \tilde f_\alpha \;=\; g^\beta_\alpha\, f_\beta\,, \quad \tilde f_m \;=\; g^m_m\, f_m\,. \tag{4.12}$$

Such a change of frame is called a *block fibre motion* on $\mathcal{F}_S$. Computing with (2.11) and (4.3a) we see that the change in P and L is given by

$$\widetilde{P}_{\alpha\beta} \;=\; \frac{P_{\gamma\varepsilon}\, g^\gamma_\alpha\, g^\varepsilon_\beta}{g^0_0\, g^m_m} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta} \;=\; \frac{P_{\gamma\bar\varepsilon}\, g^\gamma_\alpha\, \bar g^\varepsilon_\beta}{\bar g^0_0\, g^m_m}\,. \tag{4.13}$$

The transformation in the coefficients $P_{\alpha\beta}$ and $P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ precisely cancels transformation in f so that $\mathbf{P}_f = \mathbf{P}_{\tilde f}$ and $\mathbf{L}_f = \mathbf{L}_{\tilde f}$.

Next, consider a change of frame (§2.1.2) of the form

$$\tilde f_0 \;=\; f_0\,, \quad \tilde f_\alpha \;=\; f_\alpha \;+\; g^0_\alpha\, f_0\,, \quad \tilde f_m \;=\; f_m \;+\; g^0_m\, f_0 \;+\; g^\alpha_m\, f_\alpha\,. \tag{4.14}$$

These changes of frame are *shear fibre motions.* The entire group of fibre motions on $\mathcal{F}_S$ is generated by block and shear transformations. Computing with (2.11) and (4.3a) we see that P and L are unchanged by shear fibre motions:

$$\widetilde{P}_{\alpha\beta} \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta} \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,. \tag{4.15}$$

As a consequence of (4.13) and (4.15) we see that $\mathbf{P}_f$ and $\mathbf{L}_f$ are constant under the fibre motions. Our claim follows.

The tensors $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ are projectively invariant. To be precise, suppose that $\widetilde{S}$ is a second hypersurface that is projectively equivalent to S via $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$. Note that A naturally identifies $(\mathrm{Sym}^2 H^*_z S) \otimes N_z S$ with $(\mathrm{Sym}^2 H^*_{Az}\widetilde{S}) \otimes N_{Az}\widetilde{S}$, and $H^*_z S \,\otimes\, \bar H^*_z S \,\otimes\, N_z S$ with $H^*_{Az}\widetilde{S} \,\otimes\, \bar H^*_{Az}\widetilde{S} \,\otimes\, N_{Az}\widetilde{S}$. Thus we may define the pull-backs $A^*\widetilde{\mathbf{P}}$ and $A^*\widetilde{\mathbf{L}}$. From (2.8) we have $P = \widetilde{P} \circ A$ and $Q = \widetilde{Q} \circ A$. Thus $A^*\widetilde{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{P}$ and $A^*\widetilde{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{L}$. Whence projective equivalence.

Remark. G. Jensen [13] proved that a nondegenerate hypersurface S has $\mathbf{P} \equiv 0$ if and only if S is projectively equivalent to a quadric hypersurface (Section 5.2). In related work Detraz and Trépreu [8] showed that the hyperquadric appears as one of two types of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^n$ that are characterized by an elliptic system.

Remark. In the case that S is strongly $\mathbb{C}$-linearly convex the inverse matrix (4.11) exists. If $Q = (Q^{\alpha\beta})$ and $M = (Q^{\alpha\bar\beta})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_f \;&=\; Q^{\alpha\beta}\, \mathsf{f}_\alpha \mathsf{f}_\beta \otimes \mathsf{f}^m \;\in\; (\mathrm{Sym}^2 H_z S) \otimes N^*_z S\,, \qquad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{M}_f \;&=\; -Q^{\alpha\bar\beta}\, \mathsf{f}_\alpha \bar{\mathsf{f}}_\beta \otimes \mathsf{f}^m \;\in\; H_z S \,\otimes\, \bar H_z S \,\otimes\, N^*_z S\,. \end{aligned}$$

similarly define projectively invariant tensors $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ on S. Here $\mathsf{f}^m \in N^*_z S$ is dual to $\mathsf{f}_m \in N_z S$. As we will see in (6.6), $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{M}$ are pull-backs (under a 'lifted' Gauss map) of the second fundamental form of the dual-hypersurface.

5. A REDUCTION OF THE BUNDLE $\mathcal{F}_S$

In this section we will show that the second order coefficients $h_{\sigma n}$ and h_{nn} (equivalently, for $P_{\alpha m}$ and P_{mm}) may be normalized to zero. That is, $\mathcal{F}_S$ admits a sub-bundle $\mathcal{P}_S$ of adapted frames over S on which the coefficients vanish.

5.1. Normalizations.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ be a CR-hypersurface. There exists a sub-bundle $\mathcal{P}_S \subset \mathcal{F}_S$ on which the coefficients $P_{\alpha m}$ and P_{mm} vanish. In particular the restriction of the Maurer-Cartan form Ω to $\mathcal{P}_S$ satisfies*

$$\bar\Omega^m_0 \;=\; \Omega^m_0 \tag{5.2a}$$

$$\Omega^m_\alpha \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\alpha_0\,, \tag{5.2b}$$

$$\Omega^0_0 \;+\; \bar\Omega^m_m \;=\; \bar\Omega^0_0 \;+\; \Omega^m_m\,, \tag{5.2c}$$

with $P_{\beta\alpha} = P_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar P_{\alpha\bar\beta} = -P_{\beta\bar\alpha}$.

Proof. Since (2.15) holds on $\mathcal{F}_S$, equation (5.2a) is immediate. By (4.3) it remains to show that $P_{\alpha m}$ and P_{mm} can be normalized to zero. Consider a change of frame (§2.1.2) of the form (4.14). Set $h^0_m = g^0_\alpha\, g^\alpha_m - g^0_m = (g^{-1})^0_m$. Then (2.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde\Omega^0_0 \;&=\; \Omega^0_0 \;-\; g^0_\alpha\,\Omega^\alpha_0 \;+\; h^0_m\,\Omega^m_0\,, &\qquad \widetilde\Omega^\alpha_0 \;&=\; \Omega^\alpha_0 \;-\; g^\alpha_m\,\Omega^m_0\,, \quad \widetilde\Omega^m_0 \;=\; \Omega^m_0\,,\\
\widetilde\Omega^m_\alpha \;&=\; \Omega^m_\alpha \;+\; g^0_\alpha\,\Omega^m_0\,, & \widetilde\Omega^m_m \;&=\; \Omega^m_m \;+\; g^\alpha_m\,\Omega^m_\alpha \;+\; g^0_m\,\Omega^m_0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The coefficients $P_{\alpha m}$ transform as $\widetilde P_{\alpha m} = P_{\alpha m} + g^0_\alpha + P_{\alpha\beta}\, g^\beta_m + P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar g^\beta_m$. By selecting g^0_α appropriately we may may normalize to

$$P_{\alpha m} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{5.3}$$

Similarly, (4.3b) yields $\widetilde P_{mm} = P_{mm} + (g^0_\alpha\, g^\alpha_m - \bar g^0_\alpha\,\bar g^\alpha_m) - 2\,(g^0_m - \bar g^0_m)$. So we may use g^0_m to normalize $\mathrm{Im}(P_{mm}) = 0$. Since P_{mm} takes values in $\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$P_{mm} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_S \subset \mathcal{F}_S$ denote the sub-bundle on which (5.3) and (5.4) hold. □

Corollary 5.5. *The second-order invariants h_{sn}, $2 \le s \le n$, vanish on $\mathcal{P}_S$. In particular, the following relations hold on $\mathcal{P}_S$:*

$$0 \;=\; \omega^{n+1}_0 \;=\; \omega^n_1\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_1 \;=\; \omega^n_0\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_\sigma \;=\; h_{\sigma\tau}\,\omega^\tau_0\,, \quad \omega^{n+1}_n \;=\; \omega^1_0 \;=\; -\omega^n_{n+1}\,.$$

Proof. The corollary follows from (2.4), (2.15), (3.4), (3.3), (4.4) and Lemma 5.1. □

Remark 5.6. The bundle $\mathcal{P}_S$ is of (real) dimension $2m^2+3$ and is preserved by the shear fibre motions (4.14) satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
g^0_\alpha \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,g^\beta_m \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar g^\beta_m \;&=\; 0\,, \qquad \text{and}\\
4\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Im}(g^0_m) \;=\; 2\,(g^0_m - \bar g^0_m) \;&=\; (g^0_\alpha\, g^\alpha_m \;-\; \bar g^0_\alpha\,\bar g^\alpha_m) \;=\; 2\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Im}(g^0_\alpha\, g^\alpha_m)\\
&=\; -P_{\alpha\beta}\, g^\alpha_m\, g^\beta_m \;+\; \overline{P_{\alpha\beta}\, g^\alpha_m\, g^\beta_m} \;-\; 2\,P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\, g^\alpha_m\,\bar g^\beta_m\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Lemma 5.8. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ be a CR-hypersurface and $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$. Then $L_A(\mathcal{P}_S) = \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde S}$, where $\widetilde S = A(S) \subset \mathbb{P}W$.*

Proof. In Remark 2.12 we observed that $L_A(\mathcal{F}_S) = \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde S}$. Thus $L_A(\mathcal{P}_S) \subset \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde S}$. From left-invariance (2.8) of Ω we see that (5.2) holds on $L_A(\mathcal{P}_S)$. Hence $L_A(\mathcal{P}_S) = \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde S}$. □

Proposition 5.9. *Two CR-hypersurfaces $S, \widetilde{S} \subset \mathbb{P}W$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that $\phi^*(\Omega_{|\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \Omega_{|\mathcal{P}_S}$. (Equivalently, $\phi^*(\omega_{|\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \omega_{|\mathcal{P}_S}$.)*

The proof of Proposition 5.9 is identical to that of Proposition 2.13.

5.2. **Example: the hyperquadric.** The homogenous model of a strongly pseudoconvex hypersurface in $\mathbb{CP}^n$ is the hyperquadric. Fix a frame $\mathsf{e} = (\mathsf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathsf{e}_{n+1})$ of V in $\mathcal{F}$ and let $\mathsf{f} = (\mathsf{f}_0, \ldots, \mathsf{f}_m)$ be the corresponding basis of W. Define linear coordinates $z = z^a \mathsf{f}_a$ on W. Let $[z] = [z^0 : \cdots : z^m]$ be the corresponding complex homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}W$. Define

$$q(z) \;=\; \bar{z}^t Q z \;=\; \mathrm{i}(z^0 \bar{z}^m - z^m \bar{z}^0) \;+\; \sum_\alpha z^\alpha \bar{z}^\alpha .$$

Let $\mathrm{SU}(1,m) = \mathrm{SU}(W,q) \subset \mathrm{GL}(W)$ be the subgroup stabilizing q. Then the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(1,m)$ is given by matrices $X = (X^a_b) \in \mathfrak{gl}(W)$ satisfying the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \;=\; \bar{X}^0_0 + X^m_m \;=\; \bar{X}^m_0 - X^m_0 \;=\; \bar{X}^0_m - X^0_m \;=\; \bar{X}^m_\alpha - \mathrm{i} X^\alpha_0 \;=\; \bar{X}^\alpha_m + \mathrm{i} X^0_\alpha , \\ &(X^\alpha_\beta) \in \mathfrak{u}(m-1) , \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{Tr}(X) = 0 . \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Let $S = \{q = 0\} \subset \mathbb{P}W$. Note that $\mathsf{e} \in \mathcal{F}_S$. Define $\mathcal{G} = \mathrm{SU}(1,m) \cdot \mathsf{e} \subset \mathcal{F}_S$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is a sub-bundle of the adapted frames over S, and is naturally identified with $\mathrm{SU}(1,m)$. The Maurer-Cartan form, when restricted to $\mathcal{G}$, takes values in $\mathfrak{su}(1,m)$. In particular,

$$\Omega^m_\alpha \;=\; -\mathrm{i}\, \bar{\Omega}^\alpha_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bar{\Omega}^0_0 \;+\; \Omega^m_m \;=\; 0 .$$

We see that $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}_S$, and $P_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ and $P_{\alpha\bar{\beta}} = -\mathrm{i}\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ on $\mathcal{G}$.

5.3. **An $\boldsymbol{\omega}$–coframe on $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}_S}$.** By Corollary 5.5 we have $0 = h_{\sigma n} = h_{nn}$ on the sub-bundle $\mathcal{P}_S$. Differentiating these expressions and applying (3.4), (3.5), (3.13) and (2.4) yields $0 = h_{1sn}$ and

$$\omega^1_\sigma \;+\; h_{\sigma\tau}\, \omega^\tau_n \;=\; -h_{\sigma\tau n}\, \omega^\tau_0 \;-\; h_{\sigma nn}\, \omega^n_0 \,, \tag{5.11a}$$

$$\omega^0_\sigma \;+\; J^\nu_\sigma\, h_{\nu\tau}\, \omega^\tau_n \;=\; -J^\nu_\sigma\, h_{\nu n\tau}\, \omega^\tau_0 \;-\; J^\nu_\sigma\, h_{\nu nn}\, \omega^n_0 \,, \tag{5.11b}$$

$$2\,\omega^0_{n+1} \;\overset{(2.4)}{=}\; -2\,\omega^1_n \;=\; h_{nn\tau}\, \omega^\tau_0 \;+\; h_{nnn}\, \omega^n_0 \,. \tag{5.11c}$$

Note that (5.11b) is a consequence of (3.12) and (5.11a).

Lemma 5.12. *The*

$$E_\omega(\mathcal{P}_S) \;:=\; \{\omega^0_0,\, \omega^t_0,\, \omega^{2\alpha}_{2\beta},\, \omega^{2\alpha+1}_{2\beta},\, \omega^0_n,\, \omega^\tau_n,\, \omega^n_n\}$$

form a coframing of $\mathcal{P}_S$. The remaining components of ω are given by (2.4)*, Corollary 5.5,* (5.11a) *and* (5.11c)*.*

The claim that $E_\omega(\mathcal{P}_S)$ is a coframing on $\mathcal{P}_S$ follows by dimension count. See Remark 5.6.

Corollary 5.13. *Two CR-hypersurfaces $S, \widetilde{S} \in \mathbb{P}W$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that*

$$\phi^* E_\omega(\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}) \;=\; E_\omega(\mathcal{P}_S) \,, \tag{5.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\sigma\tau} &= \widetilde{h}_{\sigma\tau}\circ\phi\,, & h_{\sigma\tau n} &= \widetilde{h}_{\sigma\tau n}\circ\phi\,,\\ h_{\sigma nn} &= \widetilde{h}_{\sigma nn}\circ\phi\,, & h_{nnn} &= \widetilde{h}_{nnn}\circ\phi\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Equivalently, $\phi^*(\omega_{|\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \omega_{|\mathcal{P}_S}$.

Proof. By the relations (2.15), (3.3), (5.11b) and (5.11c) the equations (5.14) and (5.15) hold if and only if $\phi^*(\omega_{|\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \omega_{|\mathcal{P}_S}$. The corollary then follows from Proposition 5.9. □

In order to establish the Ω–versions of Lemma 5.12 and Corollary 5.13 (in Section 5.6) we must first compute two derivatives in Sections 5.4 and 5.5.

5.4. **Differentiate** (5.2b)**.** Differentiating (5.2b) with (2.7) produces

$$0 \;=\; \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta}\wedge\Omega^\beta_0 \;+\; \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta}\wedge\bar\Omega^\beta_0 \;-\; \big(\Omega^0_\alpha \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_m \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_m\big)\wedge\Omega^m_0\,,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} &= \mathrm{d}P_{\alpha\beta} \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,(\Omega^0_0+\Omega^m_m) \;-\; P_{\gamma\beta}\,\Omega^\gamma_\alpha \;-\; P_{\alpha\gamma}\,\Omega^\gamma_\beta\,,\\ \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta} &= \mathrm{d}P_{\alpha\bar\beta} \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,(\bar\Omega^0_0+\Omega^m_m) \;-\; P_{\gamma\bar\beta}\,\Omega^\gamma_\alpha \;-\; P_{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,\bar\Omega^\gamma_\beta\,. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1 implies

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} \;=\; \mathcal{P}_{\beta\alpha} \quad\text{and}\quad \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{\alpha\bar\beta} \;=\; -\mathcal{P}_{\beta\bar\alpha}\,. \tag{5.16}$$

Cartan's Lemma 4.1 and (5.16) yield functions $P_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$, $P_{\alpha\beta\bar\gamma}$, $P_{\alpha\beta m}$, $P_{\alpha\bar\beta\gamma}$, $P_{\alpha\bar\beta\bar\gamma}$, $P_{\alpha\bar\beta m}$, $P_{\alpha mm} : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\beta} &= P_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\,\Omega^\gamma_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta\bar\gamma}\,\bar\Omega^\gamma_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta m}\,\Omega^m_0\,,\\ \mathcal{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta} &= P_{\alpha\bar\beta\gamma}\,\Omega^\gamma_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta\bar\gamma}\,\bar\Omega^\gamma_0 \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta m}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \end{aligned}$$

$$\Omega^0_\alpha \;+\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_m \;+\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_m \;=\; -P_{\alpha\beta m}\,\Omega^\beta_0 \;-\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta m}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_0 \;-\; P_{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \tag{5.17}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \;=\; P_{\beta\alpha\gamma} \;=\; P_{\alpha\gamma\beta}\,,\quad P_{\alpha\beta\bar\gamma} \;=\; P_{\beta\alpha\bar\gamma} \;=\; P_{\alpha\bar\gamma\beta}\,,\quad P_{\alpha\bar\beta\bar\gamma} \;=\; P_{\alpha\bar\gamma\bar\beta}\,,\\ P_{\alpha\beta m} \;=\; P_{\beta\alpha m}\,,\qquad \bar P_{\alpha\bar\beta\gamma} \;=\; -P_{\beta\bar\alpha\bar\gamma}\,,\qquad \bar P_{\alpha\bar\beta m} \;=\; -P_{\beta\bar\alpha m}\,. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (5.17) is the Ω–version of (5.11b), and it is straight forward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha\beta m} &= \tfrac12\left(h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1,n} \;-\; h_{2\beta,2\alpha+1,n}\right) \;-\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(h_{2\alpha,2\beta,n} \;-\; h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1,n}\right)\,,\\ P_{\alpha\bar\beta m} &= \tfrac12\left(h_{2\alpha,2\beta+1,n} \;-\; h_{2\beta,2\alpha+1}\right) \;-\; \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}\left(h_{2\alpha,2\beta,n} \;+\; h_{2\alpha+1,2\beta+1,n}\right)\,,\\ P_{\alpha mm} &= h_{2\alpha+1,nn} \;+\; \mathrm{i}\,h_{2\alpha,nn}\,. \end{aligned}$$

5.5. **Differentiate** (5.2c)**.** Differentiating (5.2c) produces

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;=\; &\big(-\Omega^0_\alpha \;-\; P_{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_m \;-\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_m\big)\wedge\Omega^\alpha_0 \;+\; \big(\bar\Omega^0_\alpha \;+\; \bar P_{\alpha\beta}\,\bar\Omega^\beta_m \;+\; \bar P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\Omega^\beta_m\big)\wedge\bar\Omega^\alpha_0\\ &+\; 2\,\big(\bar\Omega^0_m \;-\; \Omega^0_m\big)\wedge\Omega^m_0\,. \end{aligned}$$

Cartan's Lemma 4.1 yields $P_{m^3} : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$-2\,(\Omega^0_m \;-\; \bar\Omega^0_m) \;=\; P_{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^\alpha_0 \;-\; \bar P_{\alpha mm}\,\bar\Omega^\alpha_0 \;-\; P_{m^3}\,\Omega^m_0 \quad\text{with}\quad \bar P_{m^3} \;=\; -P_{m^3}\,. \tag{5.18}$$

This expression is the Ω–version of (5.11c). It is straight-forward to check that

$$P_{mmm} \;=\; -2\mathrm{i}\, h_{nnn}\,.$$

Remark. The coefficient functions P_{abc} in this section and Section 5.4 are the third-order invariants of S with respect to Ω. Unlike $P_{\alpha\beta}$ and $P_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ they do not yield well-defined tensors on S.

5.6. **A Ω–coframe on $\mathcal{P}_S$.** In analogy with Lemma 5.12 we have the following.

Lemma 5.19. *The 1-forms*

$$E_\Omega(\mathcal{P}_S) \;:=\; \{\Omega^0_0\,, \bar\Omega^0_0\,, \Omega^\alpha_0,\, \bar\Omega^\alpha_0\,, \Omega^m_0,\, \Omega^\alpha_\beta,\, \bar\Omega^\alpha_\beta\,, \Omega^m_m,\, \Omega^\alpha_m,\, \bar\Omega^\alpha_m,\, \Omega^0_m\}$$

form a coframing of $\mathcal{P}_S$ (over $\mathbb{R}$) and the remaining components of Ω are given by (5.2)*,* (5.17) *and* (5.18)*.*

The lemma follows by dimension count, see Remark 5.6.

Remark. In the case that S is strongly $\mathbb{C}$-linearly convex, the $\{\Omega^\alpha_0,\, \Omega^\alpha_m\}$ in the coframing may be replaced with the $\{\Omega^m_\alpha,\, \Omega^0_\alpha\}$. See Section 5.7.

Corollary 5.20. *Two CR-hypersurfaces $S, \widetilde{S} \in \mathbb{P}W$ are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}$ such that*

$$\phi^* E_\Omega(\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}) \;=\; E_\Omega(\mathcal{P}_S)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha\beta} &= \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\beta}\circ\phi\,, \quad & P_{\alpha\bar\beta} &= \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta}\circ\phi\,,\\ P_{\alpha\beta m} &= \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\beta m}\circ\phi\,, \quad & P_{\alpha\bar\beta m} &= \widetilde{P}_{\alpha\bar\beta m}\circ\phi\,,\\ P_{\alpha mm} &= \widetilde{P}_{\alpha mm}\circ\phi\,, \quad & P_{mmm} &= \widetilde{P}_{mmm}\circ\phi\,. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, $\phi^*(\Omega_{|\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{S}}}) = \Omega_{|\mathcal{P}_S}$.

The proof is identical to that of Corollary 5.13, and is left to the reader.

5.7. **The case that S is SCLC.** In the case that S is strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex (Definition 4.7) equations (5.2b), (5.17) and (5.18) have alternate formulations. Let $Q = (Q^{\alpha\beta})$ and $M = (Q^{\alpha\bar\beta})$ be given by (4.11). Then

$$\Omega^\alpha_0 \;=\; Q^{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^m_\beta \;-\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^m_\beta\,, \tag{5.21a}$$

$$\Omega^\alpha_m \;+\; Q^{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^0_\beta \;-\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^0_\beta \;=\; -Q^{\alpha\beta m}\,\Omega^m_\beta \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta m}\,\bar\Omega^m_\beta \;-\; Q^{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \tag{5.21b}$$

$$-2\,(\Omega^0_m \;-\; \bar\Omega^0_m) \;=\; Q^{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; \bar Q^{\alpha mm}\,\bar\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; P_{m^3}\,\Omega^m_0\,, \tag{5.21c}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{\alpha\beta m} &= Q^{\alpha\gamma}\,P_{\gamma\varepsilon m}\,Q^{\varepsilon\beta} \;+\; Q^{\alpha\gamma}\,P_{\gamma\bar\varepsilon m}\,Q^{\beta\bar\varepsilon} \;-\; Q^{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,\bar P_{\gamma\varepsilon m}\,Q^{\beta\bar\varepsilon} \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,P_{\varepsilon\bar\gamma m}\,Q^{\varepsilon\beta}\,,\\ Q^{\alpha\bar\beta m} &= Q^{\alpha\gamma}\,P_{\gamma\varepsilon m}\,Q^{\varepsilon\bar\beta} \;-\; Q^{\alpha\gamma}\,P_{\gamma\bar\varepsilon m}\,\bar Q^{\varepsilon\beta} \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,\bar P_{\gamma\varepsilon m}\,\bar Q^{\varepsilon\beta} \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,P_{\varepsilon\bar\gamma m}\,Q^{\varepsilon\bar\beta}\,,\\ Q^{\alpha mm} &= Q^{\alpha\gamma}\,P_{\gamma mm} \;-\; Q^{\alpha\bar\gamma}\,\bar P_{\gamma mm}\,. \end{aligned}$$

As we will see in Section 6, the coefficients Q above may be identified with the P coefficients of the dual hypersurface.

6. Dual hypersurfaces

In this section we define the Gauss map of a CR-hypersurface $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ and characterize the self-dual strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex (SCLC) hypersurfaces (Theorem 6.8).

6.1. **Gauss map.** Let $\mathcal{F}_S$ be the adapted frame bundle over a SCLC hypersurface S. Given $f = (f_0, \ldots, f_m) \in \mathcal{F}_S$, let $z = [f_0] \in S$, and let $\widehat{H}_z S = \widehat{T}_z S \cap \mathsf{J}(\widehat{T}_z S)$ be the maximal complex subspace of $\widehat{T}_z S \subset W$. Note that $\widehat{H}_z S = \mathrm{span}\{f_0, \ldots, f_{m-1}\}$ (see §2.2). Let $(f^0, \ldots, f^m) \in W^*$ be the basis dual to f. Note that f^m vanishes when restricted to $\widehat{H}$. Since $\widehat{H}$ depends only on $z \in S$, this implies that, modulo rescaling, f^m depends only on $z \in S$. In particular, the map $\mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{P}W^*$ sending $f \mapsto [f^m] \in \mathbb{P}W^*$ descends to S where it defines the *Gauss map*

$$\gamma : S \ \to \ \mathbb{P}W^* .$$

Under the identification of $\mathbb{P}W^*$ with the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(m, m+1)$ of m-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$–planes in W, γ is the map sending $z \in S$ to $\widehat{H}_z S \in \mathrm{Gr}(m, m+1)$.

Definition. The image $S^* = \gamma(S)$ is the *dual of* S.

Let $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \ldots, \zeta_m) \in \mathrm{GL}(W^*)$ denote a basis of W^*. The Maurer-Cartan form Λ on $\mathrm{GL}(W^*)$ is defined by $\mathrm{d}\zeta_a = \Lambda^b_a \, \zeta_b$. Define a map $\Gamma : \mathrm{GL}(W) \to \mathrm{GL}(W^*)$ by $\Gamma(f) = (f^m, f^\alpha, f^0)$. Note that $\Gamma^2 = \mathrm{Id}$. From (2.6) we see that

$$\mathrm{d}f^a \ = \ -\Omega^a_b \, f^b . \tag{6.1}$$

Thus,

$$\Gamma^* \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^0_0 & \Lambda^0_\beta & \Lambda^0_m \\ \Lambda^\alpha_0 & \Lambda^\alpha_\beta & \Lambda^\alpha_m \\ \Lambda^m_0 & \Lambda^m_\beta & \Lambda^m_m \end{pmatrix} \ = \ - \begin{pmatrix} \Omega^m_m & \Omega^\beta_m & \Omega^0_m \\ \Omega^m_\alpha & \Omega^\beta_\alpha & \Omega^0_\alpha \\ \Omega^m_0 & \Omega^\beta_0 & \Omega^0_0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{6.2}$$

The following lemma is well-known; see [1, §2.5]. We give a proof as a warm-up to Theorem 6.8.

Lemma 6.3. *If $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ is a strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex hypersurface, then $S^* \subset \mathbb{P}W^*$ is also a strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex hypersurface and $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_S) = \mathcal{P}_{S^*}$.*

Proof. From (6.1) we have

$$\mathrm{d}f^m \ = \ -\Omega^m_0 \, f^0 - \Omega^m_\beta \, f^\beta - \Omega^m_m \, f^m . \tag{6.4}$$

It is a consequence of strong $\mathbb{C}$–linear convexity that $\{\Omega^m_0, \Omega^m_\alpha, \bar\Omega^m_\alpha, \Omega^m_m, \bar\Omega^m_m\}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$ on $\mathcal{F}_S$, see (5.21a). Thus, $\widehat{T}_{\gamma(z)} S^* = \mathrm{d}\gamma(T_f \mathcal{F}_S)$ is of real dimension $n + 1 = 2m + 1$. In particular, S^* is a hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}W^*$.

From (6.1) we see that Γ maps $\mathcal{F}_S$ to $\mathcal{F}_{S^*}$. If we restrict Γ to $\mathcal{P}_S$, then (6.2) and Lemma 5.1 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^*(\bar\Lambda^m_0) \ &= \ \Gamma^*(\Lambda^m_0) , \\ \Gamma^*(\Lambda^m_\alpha) \ &= \ -\Omega^\alpha_0 \ = \ -Q^{\alpha\beta} \, \Omega^m_\beta \ + \ Q^{\alpha\bar\beta} \, \bar\Omega^m_\beta \ = \ Q^{\alpha\beta} \, \Gamma^*(\Lambda^\beta_0) \ - \ Q^{\alpha\bar\beta} \, \Gamma^*(\bar\Lambda^\beta_0) , \\ \Gamma^*(\bar\Lambda^0_0 \ + \ \Lambda^m_m) \ &= \ \Gamma^*(\Lambda^0_0 \ + \ \bar\Lambda^m_m) . \end{aligned}$$

The coefficients $Q = (Q^{\alpha\beta})$ and $M = (Q^{\alpha\bar\beta})$ above are defined by (4.11). Since $\Gamma : \mathrm{GL}(W) \to \mathrm{GL}(W^*)$ is a diffeomorphism, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar\Lambda^m_0 &= \Lambda^m_0 \,, \\ \Lambda^m_\alpha &= Q^{\alpha\beta}\,\Lambda^\beta_0 \;-\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Lambda^\beta_0 \,, \\ \bar\Lambda^0_0 + \Lambda^m_m &= \Lambda^0_0 + \bar\Lambda^m_m \,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

This implies that $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_S) = \mathcal{P}_{S^*}$, and

$$Q^{\alpha\beta} \;=\; \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\beta}) \quad \text{and} \quad -\,Q^{\alpha\bar\beta} \;=\; \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta})\,, \tag{6.6}$$

where $P^*_{\alpha\beta}$ and $P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta}$ are the coefficients of the second fundamental form on S^*.

To see that S^* is strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex it suffices, by (6.6) and (4.10), to show that

$$0 \;\neq\; \mathrm{i}\,\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{w}^t & \bar{\mathsf{w}}^t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Q & -M \\ \bar M & -\bar Q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{w} \\ \bar{\mathsf{w}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6.7}$$

for all $0 \neq \mathsf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$. Define $0 \neq \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{w} \\ \bar{\mathsf{w}} \end{pmatrix} \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} P & -L \\ \bar L & -\bar P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{z} \\ \bar{\mathsf{z}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the right-hand side of (6.7) is equal to

$$\mathrm{i}\,\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{z}^t & \bar{\mathsf{z}}^t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P & -L \\ \bar L & -\bar P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{z} \\ \bar{\mathsf{z}} \end{pmatrix} \;=\; 2\,\mathrm{Im}\,P(\mathsf{z},\mathsf{z}) \;-\; 2\,\mathrm{i}L(\mathsf{z},\bar{\mathsf{z}})\,.$$

Since S is SCLC this quantity is nonzero for all $0 \neq \mathsf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$; see (4.9). We conclude that (6.7) holds and S^* is SCLC. □

6.2. **Self-dual hypersurfaces.**

Definition. The SCLC hypersurface S is *self-dual* if there exists an (complex) linear isomorphism $A : W^* \to W$ such that $A(S^*) = S$.

Theorem 6.8. *A strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex CR-hypersurface $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ is self-dual if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathcal{P}_S$ such that*

$$\phi^* \begin{pmatrix} \Omega^0_0 & \Omega^0_\beta & \Omega^0_m \\ \Omega^\alpha_0 & \Omega^\alpha_\beta & \Omega^\alpha_m \\ \Omega^m_0 & \Omega^m_\beta & \Omega^m_m \end{pmatrix} \;=\; -\begin{pmatrix} \Omega^m_m & \Omega^\beta_m & \Omega^0_m \\ \Omega^m_\alpha & \Omega^\beta_\alpha & \Omega^0_\alpha \\ \Omega^m_0 & \Omega^\beta_0 & \Omega^0_0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.9}$$

In particular, the map ϕ must satisfy

$$Q^{\alpha\beta} \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta}\circ\phi\,, \quad -Q^{\alpha\bar\beta} \;=\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta}\circ\phi\,, \tag{6.10a}$$

$$Q^{\alpha\beta m} \;=\; P_{\alpha\beta m}\circ\phi\,, \quad -Q^{\alpha\bar\beta m} \;=\; P_{\alpha\bar\beta m}\circ\phi\,, \tag{6.10b}$$

$$Q^{\alpha m m} \;=\; P_{\alpha m m}\circ\phi\,, \quad P_{mmm} \;=\; P_{mmm}\circ\phi\,. \tag{6.10c}$$

Proof. Suppose that S is self dual. Then there exists a linear isomorphism $A : W^* \to W$ such that $A(S^*) = S$. Given $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \zeta_\alpha, \zeta_m) \in \mathrm{GL}(W^*)$ define $f = A(\zeta) = (f_0, f_\alpha, f_m) \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ by $f_a := A(\zeta_a)$. This defines an induced map $\mathcal{L}_A : \mathrm{GL}(W^*) \to \mathrm{GL}(W)$. We have

$$\mathcal{L}_A^*(\Omega_f) = \Lambda_\zeta\,. \tag{6.11}$$

This, together with (6.2), implies that $\phi = \mathcal{L}_A \circ \Gamma$ satisfies (6.9).

Conversely suppose that there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{P}_S \to \mathcal{P}_S$ satisfying (6.9). Note that the right-hand side of (6.9) is a $\mathfrak{gl}(W)$–valued 1-form satisfying the Maurer-Cartan equation. It now follows from Theorem 2.14 that $\phi = \mathcal{L}_A \circ \Gamma$ for some linear isomorphism $A : W^* \to W$.

It remains to establish (6.10). The first line (6.10a) is a consequence of (6.6). To establish (6.10b) consider the S^* version of (5.17). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\beta m})\,\Omega^m_\beta \;+\; \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta m})\,\bar\Omega^m_\beta \;+\; \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha mm})\,\Omega^m_0 \\
&\qquad \overset{(6.2)}{=} \quad -\Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\beta m}\Lambda^\beta_0 \;+\; P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta m}\bar\Lambda^\beta_0 \;+\; P^*_{\alpha mm}\Lambda^m_0) \\
&\qquad \overset{(5.17)}{=} \quad \Gamma^*(\Lambda^0_\alpha \;+\; P^*_{\alpha\beta}\,\Lambda^\beta_m \;+\; P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Lambda^\beta_m) \\
&\qquad \overset{(6.2),(6.6)}{=} \quad -\Omega^\alpha_m \;-\; Q^{\alpha\beta}\,\Omega^0_\beta \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta}\,\bar\Omega^0_\beta \\
&\qquad \overset{(5.21b)}{=} \quad Q^{\alpha\beta m}\,\Omega^m_\beta \;+\; Q^{\alpha\bar\beta m}\,\bar\Omega^m_\beta \;+\; Q^{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^m_0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\beta m}) \;=\; Q^{\alpha\beta m}\,, \quad \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha\bar\beta m}) \;=\; -Q^{\alpha\bar\beta m} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha mm}) \;=\; Q^{\alpha mm}\,. \tag{6.12}$$

This yields (6.10b).

To establish (6.10c) consider the S^* version of (5.18)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha mm})\,\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; \Gamma^*(\bar P^*_{\alpha mm})\,\bar\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; \Gamma^*(P^*_{mmm})\,\Omega^m_0 \\
&\qquad \overset{(6.2)}{=} \quad -\Gamma^*(P^*_{\alpha mm}\Lambda^\alpha_0 \;-\; \bar P^*_{\alpha mm}\bar\Lambda^\alpha_0 \;-\; P^*_{mmm}\Lambda^m_0) \\
&\qquad \overset{(5.18)}{=} \quad 2\,\Gamma^*(\Lambda^0_m \;-\; \bar\Lambda^0_m) \;\overset{(6.2)}{=}\; -2\,(\Omega^0_m \;-\; \bar\Omega^0_m) \\
&\qquad \overset{(5.21c)}{=} \quad Q^{\alpha mm}\,\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; \bar Q^{\alpha mm}\,\bar\Omega^m_\alpha \;-\; P_{m^3}\,\Omega^m_0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\Gamma^*(P^*_{m^3}) \;=\; P_{m^3}\,. \tag{6.13}$$

This yields (6.10c). □

Remark. Note that (6.9) implies that $(\phi^2)^*\Omega = \Omega$. Thus there exists $A \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ such that $\phi^2 = L_{A|\mathcal{P}_S}$.

Example 6.14. It is well-known that the hyperquadric (see Section 5.2) is self-dual. Following the notation of Section 5.2, by an argument analogous to the proof of Theorem 6.8, the self-duality of the hyperquadric is equivalent to the existence of a map $\phi : \mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}$ such that (6.9) holds. Given $f = g \cdot \mathsf{f} \in \mathcal{G}$, with $g \in \mathrm{SU}(1, m-1)$, define $\bar f = \bar g \cdot \mathsf{f}$. Then $\phi(f_0, f_\alpha, f_m) = (-\bar f_0, \mathrm{i}\bar f_\alpha, \bar f_m)$ defines a map $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{G}$ satisfying (6.9).

6.3. **The $\boldsymbol{\omega}$–version.** The equations (6.10) provide second and third-order conditions for a SCLC hypersurface to be self-dual. If we shift from the Ω perspective to the ω perspective we obtain p-th order conditions as follows.

The equations (2.5), (4.4) and (5.21a) imply that we may solve (3.3) for ω^s_0; that is, there exist functions $k^{st} = k^{ts} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\omega^s_0 = k^{st}\,\omega^{n+1}_t$. More generally, in analogy with Proposition 3.6, there exist functions $k^{s_1\cdots s_p t} : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathbb{R}$, $p > 1$, fully symmetric in their indices, and inductively defined by

$$\begin{aligned} k^{s_1\ldots s_p t}\,\omega^{n+1}_t \quad = \quad & -\mathrm{d}k^{s_1\ldots s_p} + (p-1)\,k^{s_1\ldots s_p}\,\omega^{n+1}_{n+1} + k^{s_1\ldots s_p}\,\omega^0_0 \\ & + p\left\{(p-2)\,k^{(s_1\ldots s_{p-1}}\omega^{s_p)}_{n+1} - k^{t(s_1\ldots s_{p-1}}\,\omega^{s_p)}_t\right\} \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \tbinom{p}{j} \left\{(j-1)\,k^{(s_1\ldots s_j}\,k^{s_{j+1}\ldots s_p)}\,\omega^0_{n+1} - k^{t(s_1\ldots s_j}\,k^{s_{j+1}\ldots s_p)}\,\omega^0_t\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(Our convention is that $k^s = 0$.)

Let η denote the Maurer-Cartan form on $\mathrm{GL}(V^*, \mathsf{J})$. It is straight-forward to check that the ω–version of (6.2) is

$$\Gamma^*\eta^j_k \;=\; -\omega^{\nu(k)}_{\nu(j)}\,,$$

where ν is the permutation of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ defined by $\nu(0) = n+1$, $\nu(1) = n$, $\nu(2\alpha) = 2\alpha+1$ and $\nu^2 = \mathrm{Id}$. In particular, if h^* denotes the differential invariants on S^* given by Proposition 3.6, then

$$\Gamma^*(h^*_{s_1\cdots s_p}) \;=\; h^*_{s_1\cdots s_p}\circ\Gamma \;=\; k^{\nu(s_1)\cdots\nu(s_p)} \;=:\; k^{s_1\cdots s_p}_\nu\,.$$

This equation generalizes (with respect to ω) the equations (6.6), (6.12) and (6.13). In particular, by working with respect to ω we may strengthen Theorem 6.8 to the following.

Theorem 6.15. *A strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex CR-hypersurface $S \subset \mathbb{P}W$ is self-dual if and only if there exists a smooth map $\phi : \mathcal{F}_S \to \mathcal{F}_S$ such that*

$$\phi^*\omega^j_k = -\omega^{\nu(k)}_{\nu(j)}\,.$$

In particular, the map ϕ must satisfy

$$\phi^*(h_{s_1\cdots s_p}) \;=\; k^{s_1\cdots s_p}_\nu\,.$$

By Proposition 3.11 we have the following.

Theorem 6.16. *A strongly $\mathbb{C}$–linearly convex analytic CR-hypersurface S is self-dual if and only if there exist frames $e, \tilde{e} \in \mathcal{F}_S$ such that $h(\tilde{e}) = k_\nu(e)$.*

REFERENCES

[1] Mats Andersson, Mikael Passare, and Ragnar Sigurdsson. *Complex convexity and analytic functionals*, volume 225 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2004.

[2] R. L. Bryant, S. S. Chern, R. B. Gardner, H. L. Goldschmidt, and P. A. Griffiths. *Exterior differential systems*, volume 18 of *Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[3] Élie Cartan. Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de l'espace de deux variables complexes II. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (2)*, 1(4):333–354, 1932.

[4] Elie Cartan. Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de l'espace de deux variables complexes I. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 11(1):17–90, 1933.

[5] Élie Cartan. *La théorie des groupes finis et continus et la géométrie différentielle traitées par la méthode du repère mobile*. Les Grands Classiques Gauthier-Villars. [Gauthier-Villars Great Classics]. Éditions Jacques Gabay, Sceaux, 1992. Reprint of the edition of 1937.

[6] S. S. Chern and J. K. Moser. Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds. *Acta Math.*, 133:219–271, 1974.

[7] S. S. Chern and J. K. Moser. Erratum: "Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds" [Acta Math. **133** (1974), 219–271; MR0425155 (54 #13112)]. *Acta Math.*, 150(3-4):297, 1983.

[8] Jacqueline Detraz and Jean-Marie Trépreau. Une caractérisation des quadriques hermitiennes dans $\mathbf{C}^n$. *J. Analyse Math.*, 55:51–58, 1990.

[9] P. Griffiths. On Cartan's method of Lie groups and moving frames as applied to uniqueness and existence questions in differential geometry. *Duke Math. J.*, 41:775–814, 1974.

[10] Thomas A. Ivey and J. M. Landsberg. *Cartan for beginners: differential geometry via moving frames and exterior differential systems*, volume 61 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.

[11] Gary R. Jensen. *Higher order contact of submanifolds of homogeneous spaces*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 610. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977.

[12] Gary R. Jensen. Second order projective deformation of real hypersurfaces. *Tensor (N.S.)*, 39:135–140, 1982.

[13] Gary R. Jensen. Projective deformation and biholomorphic equivalence of real hypersurfaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 1(1):1–34, 1983.

E-mail address: `hammondc@math.tamu.edu`

E-mail address: `robles@math.tamu.edu`

Mathematics Department, Mail-stop 3368, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-3368